

APPLICANT(S): SHARONI, David
SERIAL NO.: 10/056,049
FILED: January 28, 2002
Page 6

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1 - 8 and 10 - 20 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 - 8 and 10 - 20 have been rejected. Claims 1, 8, 10 and 18 have been amended. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Seyed Azarian for granting and attending on May 8, 2007, in an in person interview with Applicants' Representative, Zeev Pearl, Reg. No. 60,234. In the interview, claim 1 was discussed in light of Fernandez et al. (US 6,697,103) and Johnson (US 6,275,855). The Examiner stated that amending the claim to include "dynamically install" would overcome the prior art. Further claim language was discussed, for example, the inclusion of "... said control unit automatically, without user input, and dynamically instructs said application bank to install..." and further "to install in real-time, after receiving an alert from one or more of said processing units, at least another one of said content-analysis applications".

It was agreed that "dynamically instruct to install" is more accurate than "dynamically install" and is fully supported by the specification. The Examiner agreed to favorably reconsider the amended claims. The undersigned thanks the Examiner for his observations and helpful suggestions regarding claim amendments. Accordingly, the amendments to claim 1 has been entered to independent claims 8, 10 and 18 so as to place all of the independent claims 1, 8, 10 and 18 in condition for allowance.

APPLICANT(S): SHARONI, David
SERIAL NO.: 10/056,049
FILED: January 28, 2002
Page 7

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4 - 8 and 10 - 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fernandez et al. (U.S. 6,697,103, herein after "Fernandez") in view of Johnson (US 6,275,855).

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fernandez et al (US Patent No. 6,697,103) in view of Monroe (Us Patent No. 6,246,320).

During the interview and in the "Interview Summary" paper given to Applicants' representative, the Examiner has indicated that the claims as amended to include "dynamically instructing to install" may overcome the prior art.

Amended Claim 1 recited: "said control unit automatically, without user input, and dynamically instructs said application bank to install in real-time, after receiving an alert from one or more of said processing units, at least another one of said content-analysis applications into at least one of said processing units based on at least one of said post-alert action rules".

Amended Claim 8 recited: "said control unit is to instruct automatically, without user input, and dynamically said application bank to install, in real-time after receiving the alert, another one of said content-analysis applications into said processing unit according to at least one of said post-alert action rules".

Amended Claim 10 recited: "automatically, without user input, and dynamically in real-time after receiving the alert, instructing to install another content-analysis application into a video or audio processing unit from an application bank having content-analysis applications based on at least one of said predefined post-alert action rules".

Amended Claim 18 recited: "automatically, without user input, and dynamically in real-time after receiving the notification, instructing said the application bank to install at least another one of said content-analysis applications into at least one of said processing units based on at least one of said pre defined post-alert action rules".

APPLICANT(S): SHARONI, David
SERIAL NO.: 10/056,049
FILED: January 28, 2002
Page 8

Fernandez and Johnson, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest at least the above recited elements of claims 1, 8, 10 and 18. Accordingly, claims 1, 8, 10 and 18 are not obvious over the combination of Fernandez and Johnson.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 1, 8, 10 and 18 are allowable and requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 8, 10 and 18 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4- 7 and 11 - 17 are dependent, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1 and 10, and include all the limitations of the parent claim. Therefore, the patentability of claims 2, 4- 7 and 11 - 17 follows directly from the patentability of one of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 4- 7 and 11 - 17 are likewise allowable and requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4- 7 and 11 - 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 3

The combination of Fernandez and Johnson was discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is likewise applicable here. Monroe cannot cure the deficiencies of the combination of Fernandez and Johnson. Accordingly claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Monroe, Fernandez and Johnson. Claim 3 is dependent from claim 1 and includes all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the patentability of claim 3 follows directly from the patentability of claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

APPLICANT(S): SHARONI, David
SERIAL NO.: 10/056,049
FILED: January 28, 2002
Page 9

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,


Zeev Pearl

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 60234

Dated: May 15, 2007

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801